

PATENT APPLICATION

Xerox Docket No. D/A1492 US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re the Application of

Ronald D. HOUSE et al.

Application No.: 10/630,863

Examiner: N. MCLEAN

Filed: July 31, 2003

Docket No.: 112226

For: MULTI-FUNCTION IMAGE FORMING DEVICE WITH BUILT-IN READ/WRITE
CD UNIT

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Appeal from Group 2625

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400
Attorneys for Appellants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	2
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	4
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	5
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	9
VII. ARGUMENT	10
A. No Permissible Combination of the Applied References Would Reasonably Have Suggested the Combinations of All of the Features Positively Recited in the Independent Claims	10
1. Claim 5	10
2. Claim 8	12
3. Claim 12	13
B. The References Are Not Combinable in the Manner Suggested by the Office Action Because the Combination of Applied References Would Impermissibly Modify the Principle of Operation of the Primary Reference	15
C. No Predictability Has Been Shown to Making the Asserted Combination of References.....	17
D. No Objective Evidence of Record Has Been Provided to Support Making the Asserted Combination	18
E. The Dependent Claims Would Not Have Been Suggested by the Applied References for the Additional Features They Recite.....	19
VIII. CONCLUSION	20
APPENDIX A - CLAIMS APPENDIX	A-1
APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE APPENDIX	B-1
APPENDIX C - RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	C-1

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal and the present application is Xerox Corporation, by way of an Assignment recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 014449, Frame 0818.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings, known to Appellants, Appellants' representative, or the Assignee, that may be related to, or that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing upon, the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 are on appeal.

Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 are pending.

No claims are allowed.

Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 are rejected.

Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13 and 14 are canceled.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No Amendment After Final Rejection has been filed. The claims stand as amended by Appellants' January 29, 2008 Amendment.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 5 is directed to a method of purchasing a portable digital storage media (paragraph [0032], lines 3-4) from a digital image forming device (paragraph [0030], lines 1-2, Fig. 1), comprising: purchase determining whether to purchase blank media (Fig. 10, step S1000 and step S1100, paragraph [0048], lines 2-5), the purchase determining comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type (Fig. 10, step S2200, Fig. 5, elements 500, 510, 520, 530, 540 and 550, paragraph [0041], lines 1-6 and paragraph [0055], line 1); media transfer determining whether to transfer data between physical media (Fig. 10, step S1200, paragraph [0049], lines 1-2), the media transfer determining comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory (Fig. 10, steps S1200 and S2000, paragraph [0049], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0053], lines 1-2); network transfer determining whether to transfer the image data from a network (Fig. 10, step S1300, paragraph [0050], lines 1-2), the network transfer determining comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 10, step S1800, paragraph [0052], line 1) and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory (Fig. 10, steps S1900 and S2100, paragraph [0052], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0054], lines 1-2); upload transfer determining whether to upload the image data to a network (Fig. 10, step S1400, paragraph [0051], lines 3-4), the upload transfer determining comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 10, step S1500, paragraph [0051], lines 3-4) and uploading the image data from external media to the network (Fig. 10, steps S1600 and S1700, paragraph [0051], lines 3-5); transferring a computer image file from a network storage (Fig. 10, step S2100, paragraph [0054], lines 1-2); dispensing the portable digital storage media (Fig. 10, step S2400, paragraph [0056], lines 1-2); and selecting a remote target and transferring the computer image file from the network storage to the portable digital storage media before the step of dispensing the portable digital storage media at the remote target (Fig. 10, steps S1800, S1900 and S2100, paragraph [0052], lines 1-2 and paragraph [0054], lines 1-2).

Claim 8 is directed to a system for purchasing a portable digital storage media (paragraph [0032], lines 3-4) from a digital image forming device (paragraph [0030], lines 1-2, Fig. 1), the system comprising: purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media (Fig. 4, element 400, paragraph [0040], lines 1-9), the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type (Fig. 5, elements 500, 510, 520, 530, 540 and 550, paragraph [0041], lines 1-6); media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0041], lines 11-15), the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory (Fig. 4, elements 100, 420, 430, 440, paragraph [0040], lines 6-15); network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network (Fig. 4, element 250, paragraph [0040], lines 12-13), the network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 11-12) and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 13-15); upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload (Fig. 4, element 420, paragraph [0040], lines 7-8), the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 4, element 430, paragraph [0040], lines 6-8) and uploading the image data from external media to the network (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 6-10); a payment interface (Fig. 6, element 600, paragraph [0042], lines 1-6); a media distribution device for dispensing the portable digital storage media (Fig. 2, element 290, paragraph [0034], lines 6-7); and a user input device for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target (Fig. 3, elements 294, 292 and 296, paragraph [0039], lines 9-12).

Claim 12 is directed to a system for transferring a computer file from a portable digital storage media, the system comprising: purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media (Fig. 4, element 400, paragraph [0040], lines 1-9), the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type (Fig. 5, elements 500, 510, 520, 530, 540 and 550, paragraph [0041], lines 1-6); media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0041], lines 11-15), the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory (Fig. 4, elements 100, 420, 430, 440, paragraph [0040], lines 6-15); network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network (Fig. 4, element 250, paragraph [0040], lines 12-13), the network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 11-12) and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 13-15); upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload (Fig. 4, element 420, paragraph [0040], lines 7-8), the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target (Fig. 4, element 430, paragraph [0040], lines 6-8) and uploading the image data from external media to the network (Fig. 4, element 100, paragraph [0040], lines 6-10); a media distribution device for distributing a storage media (Fig. 3, element 296, paragraph [0039], lines 2-4); a portable digital storage media read/write interface for coupling the portable digital storage media to the media distribution device (Fig. 2, element 270, paragraph [0035], lines 1-3); a target selector for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file comprising the image data from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target (paragraph [0040] and Fig. 4); and a payment interface for accepting payment for a transaction in which the computer file is transferred from the portable digital storage

media to the storage media (paragraph [0042], Fig. 6), wherein the storage media is paper and the media distribution device is one or more of a digital photocopier CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW and the media distribution device is a digital image forming device (paragraph [0030], Fig. 1).

The remaining claims are dependent on the above allowable independent claims.

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following grounds of rejection are presented for review:

Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0105665 to Wasilewski et al. (hereinafter "Wasilewski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,988,431 to Roe (hereinafter "Roe").

VII. ARGUMENT

The Office Action rejects the pending claims as having been obvious in view of the applied references. However, with respect to at least independent claims 5, 8 and 12, the Examiner has improperly applied the law relating to obviousness. Proper application of the law, and reasonable interpretation of the references, demonstrates that the relevant standard for obviousness has not been met, and that the claimed subject matter is allowable over the applied references.

A. **No Permissible Combination of the Applied References Would Reasonably Have Suggested the Combinations of All of the Features Positively Recited in the Independent Claims**

1. **Claim 5**

The Office Action's asserted combination of Wasilewski and Roe fails to reasonably suggest all the combinations of features positively recited in claim 5. The Office Action alleges that Wasilewski teaches many of the features positively recited in claim 5. The Office Action concedes, however, that Wasilewski fails to disclose wherein the purchase includes the purchase of a blank portable digital storage media at the kiosk. Rather, the Office Action relies on Roe in its disclosure of a disk vending machine to make up for the shortfall. The reliance on Wasilewski fails for at least the following reason.

Claim 5 recites a method of purchasing a portable digital storage media from a digital image forming device, comprising: purchase determining whether to purchase blank media, the purchase determining comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type; media transfer determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, the media transfer determining comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory; network transfer determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, the network transfer determining comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory;

upload transfer determining whether to upload the image data to a network, the upload transfer determining comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network; transferring a computer image file from a network storage; dispensing the portable digital storage media; and selecting a remote target and transferring the computer image file from the network storage to the portable digital storage media before the step of dispensing the portable digital storage media at the remote target.

Wasilewski is directed to a method of integrating functionality with non-imaging functionality using automatic teller machine (ATM) functions for providing financial transactions at a single kiosk (Abstract). Wasilewski teaches, at paragraph [0056], lines 17-20, that through a user interface 11 and application software that resides in the computer 16, the consumer/customer selects an imaging product or service, and is then instructed to perform the appropriate set of operations. Further, Wasilewski teaches that, at paragraph [0060], lines 4-23, when a customer desires to request an image product and/or service 200, the customer initiates a request on kiosk 100 and follows the prompts on the touch screen user interface 102. The customer selects the image source 202 of the image. For example, the user is questioned whether to obtain an image from a remote location via the network connection 118, imaging camera 101, image scanner 106, or from a file stored on media such as a CD, memory card/stick, disk using the peripheral options available on the computer 112, so as to begin the image acquisition process 204. Once the image is acquired, the customer can perform any image edits or enhancements allowed by kiosk 100 to get the desired image 206 for the image product/service. The customer is also prompted to select the particular image product/service 208. Prior to rendering the image product/service, the customer is prompted to select desired payment method, for example, debit card, credit card, smart card, payment via ATM functionality using either the multi-card reader 116 or ATM process 214; 216, via communication device 117 over the network connection 118.

All the decisions (determinations) made in Wasilewski require a user, or customer, to make those decisions (determinations) as prompted on the touch screen user interface. It is unreasonable for the Office Action to allege that Wasilewski teaches at least purchase determining whether to purchase blank media, media transfer determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, network transfer determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, upload transfer determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload, transferring a computer image file from a network storage, dispensing the portable digital storage media, and selecting a remote target as recited in the pending claims. None of these steps recited in the pending claims require a user to make the required decision as prompted or at all.

2. Claim 8

The Office Action's asserted combination of Wasilewski and Roe fails to reasonably suggest all the combinations of features positively recited in claim 8. The Office Action alleges that Wasilewski teaches many of the features positively recited in claim 8. The Office Action concedes, however, that Wasilewski fails to disclose wherein the purchase includes the purchase of a blank portable digital storage media at the kiosk. Rather, the Office Action relies on Roe in its disclosure of a disk vending machine to make up for the shortfall. The reliance on Wasilewski fails for at least the following reason.

Claim 8 recites a system for purchasing a portable digital storage media from a digital image forming device, the system comprising: purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media, the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type; media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory; network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, the

network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory; upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload, the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network; a payment interface; a media distribution device for dispensing the portable digital storage media; and a user input device for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target.

Similar to the argument above in support of claim 5, all the decisions made in Wasilewski require a user, or customer, to make decisions as prompted on the touch screen user interface. It is unreasonable for the Office Action to allege that Wasilewski teaches at least a purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media, media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload, a media distribution device for dispensing the portable digital storage media as recited in the pending claims. None of these steps recited in the pending claims require a user to make the required decision as prompted or at all.

3. Claim 12

The Office Action's asserted combination of Wasilewski and Roe fails to reasonably suggest all the combinations of features positively recited in claim 12. The Office Action alleges that Wasilewski teaches many of the features positively recited in claim 12. The Office Action concedes, however, that Wasilewski fails to disclose wherein the purchase includes the purchase of a blank portable digital storage media at the kiosk. Rather, the

Office Action relies on Roe in its disclosure of a disk vending machine to make up for the shortfall. This conclusion of the Office Action fails for at least the following reason.

Claim 12 recites a system for transferring a computer file from a portable digital storage media, the system comprising: purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media, the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type; media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory; network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, the network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory; upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload, the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network; a media distribution device for distributing a storage media; a portable digital storage media read/write interface for coupling the portable digital storage media to the media distribution device; a target selector for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file comprising the image data from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target; and a payment interface for accepting payment for a transaction in which the computer file is transferred from the portable digital storage media to the storage media, wherein the storage media is paper and the media distribution device is one or more of a digital photocopier CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW and the media distribution device is a digital image forming device.

Similar to the argument above in support of claim 5, all the decisions made in Wasilewski require a user, or customer, to make decisions as prompted on the touch screen user interface. It is unreasonable for the Office Action to allege that Wasilewski teaches at

least a purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media, media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media, network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network, upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload, a target selector selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file dispensing the portable digital storage media, and selecting a remote target as recited in the pending claims. None of these steps recited in the pending claims require a user to make the required decision as prompted or at all.

B. The References Are Not Combinable in the Manner Suggested by the Office Action Because the Combination of Applied References Would Impermissibly Modify the Principle of Operation of the Primary Reference

The Office Action summarily concludes that it would have been obvious to combine Wasilewski with Roe to purchase blank media storage at the kiosk. The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski in view of Roe. However, Wasilewski and Roe are not combinable in the manner suggested by the Office Action.

Wasilewski is directed to a method of integrating photographic imaging products and services functionality with non-imaging functionality using automatic teller machine functions for providing financial transactions (Abstract). Wasilewski, as the Office Action concedes, does not disclose expressly wherein the purchase determining whether to purchase blank media.

Roe, as noted above, is relied upon as disclosing the purchase of blank portable digital storage media at the kiosk. Roe teaches a vending machine system for vending computer storage media (Abstract). The Office Action summarily concludes that it would have been obvious to combine Wasilewski with Roe to purchase the blank media storage device at the

kiosk. To the extent that this is an objective of the Wasilewski device, the analysis of the Office Action regarding the combination of Roe with Wasilewski fails for at least the following reasons.

The combination of the applied references would impermissibly modify the principle operation of Wasilewski. Wasilewski provides the consumer with the flexibility to generate imaging products and conduct imaging services or perform ATM-related transactions independent of one another, to incorporate images into producing customized financial instruments at a kiosk, to access financial institution services to store or retrieve images as part of providing either imaging product/services or ATM financial instruments, and to utilize the customer's financial accounts and/or financial instruments as a means for payment of imaging products/services rendered at the kiosk. Clearly, modifying Wasilewski to enable a user to purchase blank portable digital storage media at the kiosk would impermissibly modify the principle operation of Wasilewski because one would not purchase blank media from an ATM.

Wasilewski enables production of customized financial instruments. It is unreasonable for the Office Action to allege that one of ordinary skill in the art would consider enabling a financial institution to provide means for distributing blank, unmarked, media for security reasons, or provide means for connecting to a disk vending machine which has not taken into account various security protocols for protecting a financial institution's interest. Wasilewski indicates that security is a cause for concern in Wasilewski because Wasilewski teaches, in paragraph [0062], many different means for authenticating the transaction process. Accordingly, the combination of applied references would impermissibly modify the principle of operation of Wasilewski.

**C. No Predictability Has Been Shown to Making
the Asserted Combination of References**

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have predictably combined Wasilewski with Roe in the manner suggested by the Office Action to render obvious the subject matter of the pending claims. The Office Action concludes that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wasilewski with Roe because Roe discloses a kiosk where digital storage media may be purchased. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Clearly, there is nothing in Wasilewski and/or Roe to suggest that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention, may have, in any way, predictably combined Wasilewski with Roe in the manner suggested by the Office Action, as such has not been adequately shown. There is nothing in Wasilewski or Roe to suggest that a user in Wasilewski would have had any desire or there may have been any benefit, to purchase blank media from an ATM where the user could purchase customized financial instruments. The conclusions set forth in the Office Action that Wasilewski and Roe are combinable in the manner suggested can only be arrived at through the impermissible application of hindsight reasoning based on the readings provided by Applicants' disclosure.

MPEP §2143 is explicit in setting forth exemplary rationales to guide the obviousness analysis in supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. A mandate of this MPEP section is that "[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is the clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious." Not only is this standard ignored, but there is not even an attempt by the Office Action to frame the asserted obviousness rejection over this combination of applied references under any exemplary rationale set forth in the Patent Office's guidance to its Examiners.

Accordingly, no predictability has been shown in the Office Action to making the asserted combination of references.

**D. No Objective Evidence of Record Has Been Provided
to Support Making the Asserted Combination**

No objective evidence of record has been provided to support making the asserted combination of references. The Office Action summarily concludes that it would have been obvious to combine Wasilewski with Roe to purchase blank media storage at the kiosk. The Office Action indicates, that Roe in col. 1, lines 3-40, teaches that these disks are available from commercial retail operators, but the locations and office hours of these retailers is limited and it enhances the availability of computer memory through information storage disks made available by disk vending machines. However, no objective evidence of record has been provided in the Office Action, or in the applied references, to support making the asserted combination of a method of integrating photographic imaging products and services functionality with non-imaging functionality using an automatic teller machine for providing financial transactions at a single kiosk and a disk vending machine.

Further, to any extent that Roe teaches the purchase includes the purchase of a blank portable storage media at the kiosk, this is not a reasonable conclusion upon which to base the assertion that one of ordinary skill in the art would have predictably combined any of the teachings of the references as is suggested by the Office Action with any reasonable expectation of success in achieving the objectives which are intended to be achieved by, and in the manner of, the subject matter of the pending claims.

Even after the Supreme Court's decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 US, 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), the analysis supporting an obviousness rejection must be explicit. The Supreme Court in *KSR* approved the conclusions set forth in a decision of the Federal Circuit in *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006), that "rejections on obviousness cannot

be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." The standard is also not met here with the mere conclusory statement that one of ordinary skill in the art may have combined the method of integrating photographic imaging products and services functionality using an automatic teller machine function to provide a financial transaction system of Wasilewski with the system of Roe "to purchase blank media at the kiosk." In other words, there is no rational underpinning to the articulated reasoning.


E. The Dependent Claims Would Not Have Been Suggested by the Applied References for the Additional Features They Recite

Dependent claims 6, 9, 10 and 12 would not have been suggested by the applied references. These claims are allowable for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, but also for the patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For any or all of the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections are in error as to claims 5, 8 and 12 and therefore also to each of the claims depending therefrom. Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15 are in condition for allowance. For all of the above reasons, Appellant respectfully requests this Honorable Board to reverse the rejections of claims 5, 6, 8-10, 12 and 15.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:MJS/cfr

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

Filed: November 20, 2008

APPENDIX A - CLAIMS APPENDIX

CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL:

5. A method of purchasing a portable digital storage media from a digital image forming device, comprising:

purchase determining whether to purchase blank media, the purchase determining comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type;
media transfer determining whether to transfer image data between physical media,

the media transfer determining comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory;

network transfer determining whether to transfer the image data from a network,

the network transfer determining comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory;

upload transfer determining whether to upload the image data to a network,
the upload transfer determining comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network;

transferring a computer image file from a network storage;

dispensing the portable digital storage media; and

selecting a remote target and transferring the computer image file from the network storage to the portable digital storage media before the step of dispensing the portable digital storage media at the remote target.

6. The method of claim 5, wherein the portable digital storage media comprises one or more of CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW.

8. A system for purchasing a portable digital storage media from a digital image forming device, the system comprising:

- purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media,
- the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type;
- media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media,
- the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory;
- network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network,
- the network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory;
- upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload,
- the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network;
- a payment interface;
- a media distribution device for dispensing the portable digital storage media;

and

- a user input device for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target.

9. The system of claim 8, wherein the portable digital storage media comprises one or more of CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW; and

wherein the media distribution device is a digital image forming device, and
the portable digital storage media is one or more of CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW.

10. The system of claim 8, wherein the digital image forming device is a digital photocopier.

12. A system for transferring a computer file from a portable digital storage media, the system comprising:

purchase determining unit determining whether to purchase blank media,
the purchase determining unit comprising selecting a portable digital storage media type;

media transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer image data between physical media,

the media transfer determining unit comprising transferring the image data from external media to internal media through a memory;

network transfer determining unit determining whether to transfer the image data from a network,

the network transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and downloading the image data from a network to the internal media through the memory;

upload transfer determining unit determining whether to upload the image data to a network upload,

the upload transfer determining unit comprising determining a remote target and uploading the image data from external media to the network;

a media distribution device for distributing a storage media;

a portable digital storage media read/write interface for coupling the portable digital storage media to the media distribution device;

a target selector for selecting a remote target and transferring a computer image file comprising the image data from a network storage to the portable digital storage media to be dispersed at the remote target; and

a payment interface for accepting payment for a transaction in which the computer file is transferred from the portable digital storage media to the storage media,

wherein the storage media is paper and the media distribution device is one or more of a digital photocopier CD-ROM, DVD-ROM and CD-RW and the media distribution device is a digital image forming device.

15. The system of claim 12, further comprising:

a portable electronic device interface, wherein the portable electronic device interface is in communication with the portable digital storage media and wherein the portable digital storage media is controlled by a portable electronic device.

APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE APPENDIX

NONE

APPENDIX C - RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

NONE